



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

MY MISSION.



MY MISSION:

TWELVE SHORT TRACTS

ON

RELIGIOUS SUBJECTS,

By S. H.



LONDON:

PUBLISHED BY J. H. WOODLEY,

30, FORE STREET, CITY.

1852.

141. c. 57.

LONDON:
C. HIGLY, PRINTER, PIERREPONT ROW, ISLINGTON.

PREFACE.

For this publication neither persons nor parties are responsible ; for none have been consulted.

Gain, party and the world enchain the human mind. It is a pitiable sight to see a religious man weighing and watching, lest his words should tell against his own interest or against the fancies of other men. This timidity is, however, in some degree universal. It shall be the aim of my life to beat up against such influence and such weakness.

Before any sentiment has been submitted I have endeavoured to understand and believe clearly ; from this cause one subject, promised in the second number, has been omitted. When the thought of a "*Model Church*" first occurred to my mind I had a longing for a pure Church,

undefiled *by every form of Simony, Priestcraft and Idolatry*, in teachers and people; but these influences appear to incite the active, and control the passive, with such power, that possibly what I could most love for its theoretic beauty may be only an impracticable abstraction.

However this may be, and whatever the professions may be, the great danger to Christians is, their liability to love the world and money more than the Gospel; to dignify man more than undefiled religion, and to worship the created more than the CREATOR.

In what we do or omit the controlling principle should be a sense of the Divine Presence and of our great responsibility.

S. H,

September 25, 1852.

MY MISSION.

BY S. H.,

AUTHOR OF "THOUGHTS ON THE PRACTICABILITY OF A COM-
PREHENSIVE SYSTEM OF NATIONAL RELIGIOUS EDUCATION."

No. I.
ASSAYING IN RELIGION.

OCTOBER 1, 1851.

It is proposed to publish Twelve of these Tracts. One will appear
on the 1st of each Month until the number is complete.

The subject of No. II. will be—"WHO ARE THE PEOPLE OF GOD?"

LONDON:
PUBLISHED BY J. H. WOODLEY,
30, FORE STREET, CITY.

Price Twopence.

AVOIDING verbiage, each subject in this series of Tracts will be treated as concisely as possible. The letter-press matter will therefore be exceedingly short.

Pecuniary profit is not contemplated nor desired, and should it accrue it would be applied to the object for which the publication is commenced.

Approbation from the "herd of men" is neither sought nor solicited; though should it come from good men, it will be estimated next to the approbation of Him to whose service I dedicate "MY MISSION."

S. H.

LONDON :

C. HIGLY, PRINTER, PIERREPONT ROW, ISLINGTON.

ASSAYING IN RELIGION.

“Seize hold on Truth where'er 'tis found,
Among your friends, among your foes ;
On Christian or on heathen ground—
The flower's divine where'er it grows.”

HUMAN schemes of religion are various, and exhibit different degrees of falsehood in faith, external folly, and error in practice ; still, few of these schemes are composed of unmixed falsehood, folly or error. Dross and alloy prevail ; but in human schemes, as in human character, it would be hard to say that, if tested, the moral assayer would find nothing but *base metal*.

There is the frigid, philosophic Rationalist, freezing the soul with his cold light. There is the Formalist, with his tapers, symbols and ceremonies, denying thought and spirituality. Then there is the loud Enthusiast, causing a fear lest devotion itself should lose its native dignity ; yet even all so, may not Wisdom take the kernel and

leave the shell?—may she not take the pearl and leave the fish—take the rose and leave the thorn?

We instinctively love sincerity, and fly to it, even though there may be false opinion and folly in the form of worship. The Papist has propounded his nonsensical doctrines; he has amazed us with his mummeries; but we can forgive the one, and smile upon the other, if he stamp an impression of his sincerity.

Who can be angry with him who, in his frailty of judgment and lack of light, is *true*, though it be to a foolish conviction; and who by mere error has taken to, and enjoys, a counterfeit, which he supposes to be the pearl of great price?

Only very little experience will force us to believe, that there often exists a high amount of true theoretic faith, and with it neither piety, affection, nor practical purity; these, and the confident and pompous in religion, are often put to shame, in living and in dying, by the quiet and the unphilosophical.

Again, as regards prejudice in matters of religion (although in theory we are ready to admit its prevalence), we can scarcely trace its existence in our daily practice. We freely consult Calmet,

and sing Pope's "Ode," although the former was certainly, and the latter was, perhaps, a Roman Catholic. Our Mediterranean ships find good water in the Papal states. We sponge ourselves, in health and in sickness, with sponges gathered by the Mahomedans of Smyrna. We relish our oranges, although they may be supplied by an unbelieving Jew. We keep time by Calvinist watches from Geneva; prove the credibility of Christianity by Unitarian Lardner; and study chemistry from Priestley. We wrap up our wives in Presbyterian, Paisley shawls; have the materials for our places of worship carried by Roman Catholic labourers; while the best tablets and monuments for Protestant cathedrals are designed and executed by unshakeable, Milanese Catholics.

Sterling gold has one-twelfth of alloy; fine meat is afforded by animals that feed on filth; rich fruits and delicate flowers are found on the foulest dung-heaps. In nature, and in society, we take any good that is wanted where we can best get it; and if any one can confer on us a benefit, we are satisfied to be benefited, without asking what is the faith of the man who supplies it. Adam Clarke says, "Priestley is a good authority on some subjects." Channing declares that he derived a love of piety from his friend Mr. Hopkins, the high Calvinist, whom he describes as

the teacher of "*an awful theology*." Channing also says, "We refresh our piety from books that Catholics have written." Joseph Barker, the very bitter foe of Methodism, says, "I received considerable good from my early connexion with the Methodist society." The Rev. Augustus Wm. Hare, in a visitation sermon, says, "If I receive light, I am not particular by what window." He adds: "One man in one hemisphere sees not the same heavenly bodies that another man does in the other hemisphere; but he will not deny that the other has heavenly light which he does not see."

There may be diversity of opinion, feeling, and taste; and yet there may be unity in esteem, in belief in the Bible, in hope of immortality, in the love of God and Christ, and in the pursuit of practical righteousness.

Any sincerely maintained diversity is truer "*unity of the spirit*," than any "unity of opinion in the bond of ignorance, or unity of profession in the bond of hypocrisy."

This tract is entitled "Assaying." The author is not afraid of "*Sectarianism*." Where there is sincere concord and congeniality, communion, as a "*sect*," gives the greatest pleasure and strength to religious individuals. The point, however,

with the author is, to direct to an appreciation of all systems proportional to the real, sterling worth that, on testing, can be found in each. The result must be an attachment to that sect which appears to contain the *least* amount of earthly dross; or—

Finally, to compound an individual faith and character, which, if not acceptable to any sect on earth, may be found, at last, acceptable before God, Jesus Christ, and the spirits of just men made perfect.

S. H.

C. Hig'ly, Printer, Pierrepont Row, Islington.

*By the same Author, and to be had of J. H. WOODLEY,
Fore Street, City, and of all Booksellers,*

**THOUGHTS on the PRACTICABILITY of
a COMPREHENSIVE SYSTEM of NATIONAL RELI-
GIOUS EDUCATION.—Price 6d.**

MY MISSION.

BY S. H.,

AUTHOR OF "THOUGHTS ON THE PRACTICABILITY OF A COM-
PREHENSIVE SYSTEM OF NATIONAL RELIGIOUS EDUCATION."

No. VI.

PAPACY.

MARCH 1, 1852.

It is proposed to publish Twelve of these Tracts. One will appear
on the 1st of each Month until the number is complete.

The subject of No. VII. will be—"THE GOSPEL."

LONDON:
PUBLISHED BY J. H. WOODLEY,
30, FORE STREET, CITY.

Price Twopence.

SOME may ask the meaning of "MY MISSION." An author has said, "*Every man has his mission:*" this is all that is meant.

Besides what is intrinsic, arguments and opinions, especially the latter, derive weight from the prestige of a name. The Author can confer on these Tracts no such advantage.

A Priest is a poor antagonist of Priestcraft and Papacy. Emolument weakens advocacy. The Author is not a Priest nor a paid advocate, neither will he ever be either; he would, however, guard this view. The Apostle clearly authorised, in exigencies, an exchange of the "*temporal for the spiritual,*" but he preferred to "*labour*" and to be "chargeable to none."

To good and useful men, without pecuniary means, what *can* be said? If the learned rich, who, living in idleness, delegate religion, were to do but half their duty, Priestcraft would be exploded, and even professional advocacy might then be superseded.

S. H.

LONDON:

C. HIGLY, PRINTER, PIERREPONT ROW, ISLINGTON.

PAPACY.

ASPIRING to know the will of his Maker, man listens to pretension; hence, by the pretender playing on his piety, he becomes the dupe of imposture; by a natural reaction on the supposed *oracular* proving *deception*, the dupe becomes a democrat, and he who was a slave will neither brook reasonable rule nor listen to a wise suggestion. Priestcraft, attempting to *chain* the Christian, *lets loose* the infidel.

Absolute equality does not exist: no two beings or existences are positively equal; could we for a moment make them equal, time, by growth or decay, would defeat us. Equality of station, if in abstract theory desirable, never did, will or can exist. National, municipal, educational, religious, domestic, or any other society, have, just like our physical frame, faculties and functions; and shall the hand say to the foot, "I have no need of thee?"—or shall the heart say to the head, "I have no need of thee?" Dependence is our inheritance; from the cradle to the grave it is the condition of existence. Mutual dependence, like all that is indispensable in nature, is a source of blessedness: destroy distinction—create sameness—remove diversity and variety—in mind, society or nature, and the essence of utility and harmony is lost.

God is "no respecter of persons." We should imitate Him. He discriminates; for those only

"who fear Him, and work righteousness, are accepted of Him." Who would award equally to the worthless and the excellent—to the brutish as to the noble? Who can venerate ignorance as wisdom—applaud vice as virtue—love the selfish as the benevolent—reverence the impious as the devout? First must the taste confound bitter and sweet, and the sight darkness and light.

While holy writ and sound policy sustain parental authority, and while tutors and experienced and good men can aid by wisdom and admonition, and while moral and religious power, like every influence, begets its like wherever it operates, it is an "*odious radicalism*" to deny reverence to high moral and religious character, whether it is found in the tinker's shop at Elstow, or in the archiepiscopal palace of Cambray.

But our subject is "*Papacy*." This designation extends to all *assumption of superhuman power*. Whenever or wherever official power takes in any degree a *mediatorial* position as the channel of man's communion with God, or as the medium for dispensing God's gifts and graces to man, *then* begins papistical corruption; or, in other words, *then* individual right is violated, and the prerogative of the Almighty is invaded.

"Master," "Lord," "Father," "Rabbi," are in the New Testament forbidden to be religiously applied to any but Christ or God. Think of the styles, titles and dignities of hierarchical presumption, and say,—What is idolatry?

Every *degree* of this papistical spirit is against the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, whether in Roman, Greek, Protestant or dissenting churches. The *good*, wise, useful and devout, everywhere, should be loved and revered *much more than they are*; but for all above the human, *miracles alone*, not "*lying wonders*," must attest.

To simplify, confine the view to "*THE Papacy*," that is, the Roman Papacy, denuded of all that is

extraneous or falsely identified with it, whether good or evil: let the object be to strip and exhibit the undressed Roman Papacy.

"The Papacy," then, is neither of the following:—the *Court* of Rome,—the *Religion* of Roman Catholics,—nor the *People* of the Romish community.

The *Court* of Rome is not the Papacy, for that is a little state government—a small Italian despotism, secular, local and weak. It is the asserted universal *spiritual* rule that marks "*The Papacy*."

The *Religion* of the Roman Catholics is not "*The Papacy*." The Religion consists of doctrines, tenets, forms, symbols, language, and exercises innumerable, each requiring to be tested in detail; for unless they are taken or rejected, brutishly, in the gross, no Christian can say but that *some* of them are indifferent, others almost divine, and that others are almost infernal; on each condemnation or acquiescence must be discriminating. *Acts*, as contradistinguished from *words*, require especially this discrimination; for it is the ancient and established policy of the Papacy to usher in demoniacal *acts* with angelic language. Thus, "*The Church*,"—"God,"—"The Poor,"—"The Faithful,"—"Charity,"—"Beloved," &c., &c., are used as stalking-horses to dissemble dark purposes. *Realities*, too, require stripping of mystification, which, to catch the simple, baits every service, ceremony, vestment, symbol, office and officer.

"*The Papacy*" is not the *People* of the Roman Catholic community; for the Papacy may be and is abhorred by Catholics as well as others, while individual Catholics may be and are beloved. A lamb in the claws of a wolf, or a dove in the talons of a hawk, excites ill feeling; but not against the prey. Who doubts that sincere Roman Catholics will meet us in heaven? and, although protesting against, and dissenting from,

their faith, who has ever heard, read, or associated with the "true men" of that community, but has found his religious affections refreshed by the earnestness of their piety? And whose heart has not at one and the same time beat with love for the good men, sorrow for the bondage, and indignation for their papistical oppressors? Authority against independence is the bane. Even Priests suffer by Priestcraft; for they, in turn, are oppressors and victims. *

"*The Papacy*," thus divested, is simply a *Company*—a *Corporation*, combined to trade and domineer, with the Pope as chairman. Cardinals are the directors; Councils the committees. In England it has not the legal standing of an ordinary commercial company; it neither exists by charter, act of incorporation, nor concordat. Its titles exist by stealth, and its authority by smuggling. The Chairman and Directors of the Hudson's Bay Company have as great, and the same natural and religious, right to assume universal dominion over the souls of men as have Popes, Cardinals, Priests and Councils.

The question of "*The Papacy*" is not a *religious* question at all. Priestly interference to entrap young ladies of fortune is a question of property and fraud, and requires the same magisterial control as pretended astrology and fortune-telling, or as any other of the many modes of obtaining money by false pretences. Against death-bed exactions equitable state or civil power ought to interpose, as it does in the cases of infants and of those who are incapable of managing their own affairs.

Papistical convents, even if not (as Mr. Henry Drummond, M.P. for West Surrey, says they are)

* Even that true saint, Fenelon, when under the ban of the "See of Rome," and when he was suing for reconciliation, said, "It shall not only be *submission*, but *conviction*!"

"prisons or brothels," ought, as a matter of State prudence, to be subject to secular visitation and supervision. So with monasteries; a conviction of this forced itself upon us after a visit to a monastery.

Papistical confession is not a *religious* question, but a question of public morals and decency. The notorious language of this "*Office*" would, divested of the false sanctity, very properly subject him who might use it to the infliction of the tread-wheel.

Ultramontane priestly authority also is not a question of *religion*; it is a governmental and political question. Treason is an integral part of that authority, and it can be only maintained by sedition.

The Romish Papacy stands, with a broad, daring front, between man and his Maker. It impudently says to man, "Your soul, thoughts, penitence and worship are *ours*. *We* must appropriate your worldly possessions; Heaven is addressed and reached only through *us*. Balm and peace to you if submissive; but if you resist—fire and anathema!"

"*The Papacy*" impiously usurps the prerogative of God. We might pardon a recent benediction on the baby-linen of the Princess of Spain; but it claims to bless—curse—anoint—dispense—remit—excommunicate—indulge or absolve;—briefly, it grasps *all Power*, human and Divine; it nullifies man, and sits in the "seat of God, as God."

Finally, then, reserve for Signor Mazzini and his opponents all discussion on the *Court* of Rome; reserve the *Religion* of Romanism, that *each point* may, in the future, have due meditation; reserve passing judgment on *individuals* of the Roman Catholic church, some of whom we know and love; leave judgment for Him who will judge by that Man whom He hath ordained; reserve for

“Why,” it may be asked, “should we exalt inferior beings—why detract from the glory of God, by dignifying Angels?”—God works, and ever did, and most likely for ever will work, by means and agents. Some cedars of Lebanon have been two thousand years, and some oaks have been one thousand years, in reaching maturity. He who by His word placed the sun in the firmament could have created the trees in full majesty at once if it had so pleased Him; but it has pleased Him to employ the earth, the rain, the sunshine and time for the object. He, if He had so willed, could have made man a glorified spirit, just and perfect, in heaven at once, as readily as He made Adam out of the dust of the earth; but He has chosen rather to raise up generation after generation, and to give the blessings of trial, duty, enjoyment and the warfare of life, on which He has based Divine mercy, human virtue, acceptance and eternal felicity.

Do we detract from the majesty of God because we dignify His appointments?—because we love Jesus Christ,—the Apostles,—the Prophets,—the Patriarchs,—the Bible,—parents and friends? All are but instruments—“*Ministers sent forth by God;*”—so are Angels and Archangels.—Who-soever “*planteth,*” whosoever “*watereth,*” God sendeth the agent, and He giveth the increase. God is the *Beginning and the End*—God is over all—God is all, and in all!

S. H.

MY MISSION.

BY S. H.,

AUTHOR OF "THOUGHTS ON THE PRACTICABILITY OF A COM-
PREHENSIVE SYSTEM OF NATIONAL RELIGIOUS EDUCATION."

No. VIII.

ANGELS.

MAY 1, 1852.

It is proposed to publish Twelve of these Tracts. One will appear
on the 1st of each Month until the number is complete.

The subject of No. IX. will be—"A WILLING MIND."

LONDON:
PUBLISHED BY J. H. WOODLEY,
30, FORE STREET, CITY.

Price Twopence.

THE next Number will conclude the present Work. When it is complete, the whole will be bound into a small volume.

If my life should be spared, I shall not remain idle, but as thoughts occur I shall publish them in some form or other.

From time to time, I have, for my own profit or amusement, written some short Poetic Pieces; these I propose to publish about the end of the year.

Upon the last Number, "*A Visit to a Monastery*," I have received a letter from a Monk, "*written by command of his Superiors*." The only "*matters of fact*" which he explains are—That the board "*Whosoever trespasses*," &c. was placed there by Mr. Gisborne, M.P., to preserve his game, and it is now removed. For "*1½ lbs. of bread*," it should have been "*1 lb. of bread, with soup and vegetables*." The Abbey is not "*subject to Mellerage*," but "*has independent jurisdiction*." Instead of "*on the right for novices, on the left for those in full orders*," read "*on either side are stalls, both for professed religious and for novices*." "*In summer an hour's sleep is allowed after dinner*." "*Father Alexis is not a clergyman*." The remainder of the letter is controversial, and I do not engage in controversy.

I have also received a letter from Father Alexis: this letter is full of amiable temper.

S. H.

LONDON:
C. HIGLY, PRINTER, PIERREFONT ROW, ISLINGTON.

THE SABBATH.

AFTER the active bustle of life during six days, was it ever felt that a day of rest was unprofitable? After a day of rest, does not the active man of business feel refreshed and invigorated? Does not our experience of all nature and the common sense of mankind prescribe rest and unbending after labour?

Every healthy mind, apart from religion, must appreciate the use of the Sabbath; and the *ennui*, or mawkishness, felt by some sickly minds is no more an objection than is paralysis in individuals an argument against general activity, or than biliousness with some is an argument against the use of nutritious diet.

Excess and overstatement induce many persons to fall into secularizing the Sabbath, arguing against a too *rigid* rule by rejecting *all* rule; thus both advocates fall into the common error of believing that all right and truth exist in opposites, instead of judicious moderation in all things.

The Sabbath loses, not really, but in estimation, by canting formality; the strict observance of "*days*," and the omission of the "*weightier matters*," encourage neglect in others; for, throughout the world, in religion particularly, the advocate and the cause are confounded together; and, by a fatal fallacy, the hypocrite and true piety are identified; and when one is detected the other is neglected; although it ought to be,

that counterfeits should *enhance* our value of the true and the genuine.

Like other duties, the religious observance of the Sabbath is omitted often from *inadvertence*; really conscientious persons are not awakened to a sense of duty; with these it may be said, the sin lies more in those who look on and neglect to give sound admonition.

Captiousness may be named as another cause. To object, as being easier than to discriminate, is the lurking principle of faith and practice in some minds. Early love of religious reform degenerates into habitual contradiction; pugnacity predominates; and the obviousness of a proposition, and its universal reception, is felt to dignify the eccentric objector; and, as with the charlatan and his nostrums, the vulgar take impudence for wisdom, and mistake their own astonishment for admiration.

The love of "*taking Sunday pleasure*" induces some to object to the religious use of the day. Betting, amongst those who are known as "black legs" at the West-end gambling stables; club, railway, steam-boat, pleasure-van, tea-garden and beer-shop diversion, have each influence with its respective votaries. Any person wavering as to the morality of these substitutes for religion may settle his faith by a visit, or by observing the condition of those who arrive by return trains, steam-boats and carts on a Sunday evening.

Another class—a very low class—of objectors is to be found amongst the idle, the sluggish, the sottish and the slothful; these procrastinate in the week, are driven to occupy Sunday in a feverish bustle to labour through an arrear created by their own previous laziness, and commonly excuse themselves by reflections on the "*times*," "*misfortune*" and "*the Government*."

The principal objectors are those who profit by

Sunday trading; thus, at a late meeting at the Freemasons' Tavern against the abolition of a Sunday delivery by post, the objectors consisted chiefly of the dependants on periodicals and Sunday newspapers. With traders whose market-day is Sunday, the question is met with a foregone conclusion, deduced from strong evidences of pecuniary profit, which, though not legitimately logical, is a very common basis of belief; and the opinion thus formed is very strong—so strong, that the after evidences of morality, social advantage and religion, will seldom successfully prevail against it, and the whole case throws light on the complicated question of the connexion between the love of truth and success to trade. The Jews afford a lesson to Sunday dealers. They from conscience sacrifice one day, by law they are obliged to lose another, and yet, surrounded by competition, they as a class are the richest in the community.

There is an involuntary testimony against secularizing the Sabbath in those who so occupy the day. There is the embarrassment—the apology—the lurking shame—all bespeaking a conviction, hardly conscious perhaps, that all has not been quite as it ought to have been; and besides, there is the reluctant reverence for those who unaffectedly hallow the day. An under current of approval exists with the objectors; they prefer—by their common, moral and religious sense—their own opponents to their supporters, and would not accept what they ask, *i. e.*, the abolition of the observance, if you would give it them.

We have known persons who, having been in France and New Orleans, have declared that the French habits of Sunday business and pleasure at those places have made them melancholy.

Whatever has to be done should have its own time. Work, recreation, sleep; tilling, sowing,

reaping. Time and season are appropriated to all things; truly, "*there is a time for all things.*" Shall, then, all other things have a time, and religion have no time? The particular day, we grant, mattereth but little—whether it be the Jew's or the Christian's Sabbath. Sabbath day and Sabbath night, and summer and winter, are not the same in England as at Australia; but if the spiritual and literal harvest are reaped, who will dispute about the *season*?

Days, like other external aids, are not so much religion, as they are *means, pillars* and *scaffolding* to support religion—steps to the ladder of perfection. Experience clearly makes known to us, that, however we may desire to reach an eminence, love and desire are insufficient alone; the steps must be taken that lead up to it. It must be stated as an *unquestionable* truth, that our Sabbaths are our steps to holiness; and as *they* have been employed, particularly with the young, religious character has improved or degenerated.

Some persons object to set days or occasions for religious duty; and they say, feasibly, "*Every day is a Sabbath;*" "*Every meal is a sacrament.*" "*I keep up the SPIRIT of prayer continually.*" Experience shows us clearly that this perpetual state is only sustained by the refreshment of occasional religious aid and stimulus; that is, by prayer, meditation and discourses. It is not untrue to say, that the excuses referred to are only plausible self-deceptions to throw off religious duty altogether. We will not say that dissemblers of wickedness are not to be found amongst the pretenders to sanctity, but this can be confidently declared, that those who *trade, work, idle, take pleasure, or neglect religion* on a Sunday, as a *rule*, evidence that such habits are demoralizing. Suppose there *is* a doubt, shall we give it against religion, and in favour of dissipation?

The first-day Sabbath of the Christian is, in *spirit* and moral import, the same as the seventh-day Sabbath of the Jew : it is founded on *commemoration—commandment—example* and *utility*.

Commemoration may be circumstantially varied without essential abrogation. Feasts, fasts and commemorative days have been moveable as well as fixed in the Jewish and Christian churches. In our own time celebrations of accessions, births, marriages, and other events, have been conventionally fixed. Moral bearing and the memory of events appear the great objects, not so much a correspondence of days. The great events to which a day of rest directs our attention are—the creation of the world—the resurrection of Christ—the appearance afterwards of Christ to his followers, and the revelations made by Christ to St. John.

The fourth commandment is not part of the ceremonial law but the *moral*, and the moral of this law is, that we shall remember our creation, and glorify God for it; and these duties are to be suggested by the consecration of a day which we are plainly told God has “*blessed and sanctified*.” The statement, that Noah received a message from God seven days before the flood, and that he sent forth a dove seven days after the raven, and another dove seven days after the first, suggests a conjecture that here are four Sabbaths referred to. The veneration of the Jews for the day is shown by the heavy penalties under which they enforced its observance.

The Apostles, the Disciples and the early Christians did meet on a Sabbath.

The conclusion from the Scriptures is, that, at all times, from the creation, a Sabbath has been both appointed and observed.

Moral and social advantage, even were the Scriptures totally silent, would point out, by its

utility, the necessity for a Sabbath. This department, however, involves a view too extensive for our limited space.

Jesus Christ plucked ears of corn,—healed,—did acts of mercy,—told His hearers that the Sabbath was made for man,—reproved observance of days to the neglect of justice, judgment and mercy;—it behoves us to be watchful, or we may become Pharisees, and our good may be evil spoken of. Attending at religious meetings and services is to kindle a flame that shall preserve spiritual life in our whole being throughout the intervals;—without this, religion on Sundays only is a mockery and a delusion.

Descending to a plain, practical view, let us consider, if we wish to make a religious day of rest profitable, What shall we do, or omit, to obtain a strong religious spirit?—Avoid *boisterous parties, light reading, especially newspapers*;^{*} neither *sing nor play secular music* on a Sunday; avoid *pleasure excursions, railway, steam-boat and "van" trips*; refrain from *trading and business occupations*; avoid *sluggishness and intemperate living*; don't be afraid of a quiet walk, but make it a point of conscience to attend *some* religious place of meeting once, at least, in the day; above all, endeavour to maintain throughout the day a piety—a cheerful piety—in *thought, temper and affection*.

S. H.

* It is an unsightly thing to see the father of a family who calls himself a religious man reading the ordinary class of weekly newspapers on a Sunday.

C. Higly, Printer, Pierrepont Row, Islington.

MY MISSION.

BY S. H.,

AUTHOR OF "THOUGHTS ON THE PRACTICABILITY OF A COM-
PREHENSIVE SYSTEM OF NATIONAL RELIGIOUS EDUCATION."

No. XII.

JESUS CHRIST.

SEPTEMBER 1, 1852.

The TITLE-PAGE and PREFACE will be ready on the 1st of October.

LONDON:
PUBLISHED BY J. H. WOODLEY,
30, FORE STREET, CITY.

Price Twopence.

THE present Number will complete all I intend to publish of the present Work.

On the 1st of October there shall be prepared a Title-page and short Preface for any of my friends who may be disposed to bind the Twelve Numbers together.

On the same day the whole may be had in a small volume, with which shall be bound the Tract "Thoughts on the Practicability of a Comprehensive System of National Religious Education."

From time to time, I have, for my own profit or amusement, written some short Poetic Pieces; these I propose to publish about the end of the year.

S. H.

**LONDON :
C. NIGLY, PRINTER, PIERREPONT ROW, ISLINGTON.**

JESUS CHRIST.

“ When I read the commentators I am puzzled, but when I read the New Testament itself I can enjoy it.”—H. HOPKINS.

VOLUMES have been written upon religion, until men have almost forgotten that all true Christian Faith must be founded only upon that heavenly, yet small and simple, volume called the New Testament; from that to any other authority the greatest and wisest cannot appeal, and in it the humblest may find that those who run may read. Let it be said, with all reverence, that even prophetic obscurities in the Old, and all “*things hard to be understood*” in the New, Testament must receive their construction from the PLAIN words of Jesus Christ and his Apostles.

We therefore pass by *Decrees, Creeds, Catechisms, Articles, Councils, Diets and Assemblies*, that nothing may be “*taken from or added to the sayings of that Book* ;” we leave the set, arbitrary conventionalities of parties, and take “*The Word*” from the pure Fountain Head of Living Truth, untainted by human tributaries.

We put aside, as far as mortals can, every weight that may unduly bend the mind, and dissipate every mist that might colour, diminish or enlarge the simple teaching of the *New Testament* as to Christ, and the homage we must pay to Him.

No matter what men may say, in their love of their own sect, “*Hear the Church*,” except as friendly admonition, is exploded. Dogmatic authority was for the dark ages, and tradition must not make void the word of Christ and his Apostles. We are taught that Jesus Christ is the great

Teacher—Exemplar—Prophet—Saviour—Mediator—Judge—*was, is, and is to be Lord over all.* His Nature, Office, and Dignity can afford, and have afforded, a boundless range for thought and meditation. To limit our view to one or two essential aspects is all that is practicable, and may be all that is most profitable.

1. What are we taught as to His Power, Dignity and Glory? 2. What do we learn of Him as an object of worship? The number of passages which set forth His high attributes are overwhelming. As a clue we adduce the following:—

Matt. xxviii. 18, "*All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth.*"

John iii. 35, "The Father . . . hath given *all things* into His hand."

John v. 19, "What things soever *He [the Father]* doeth, *these also doeth the Son likewise.*"

John v. 26, "*For as the Father hath life in Himself; so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself.*"

John xiv. 20, "*I am in my Father, and ye in Me, and I in you*"

John xvi. 15, "*All things that the Father hath are mine.*"

John xvii. 21, "That they all may be one; as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that *they also may be one in Us.*"

Acts x. 36, "Jesus Christ: He is *Lord of all.*"

1 Cor. i. 24, "Christ, the *power of God, and the wisdom of God.*"

1 Cor. xv. 27, "He hath put all things under His [viz. Christ's] feet."

2 Cor. iv. 4, "Christ, who is the *Image of God.*"

Col. iii. 11, "But Christ is all, and in all."

Heb. ii. 5, 8, "Unto the angels hath He not put in subjection the world to come . . . but . . . Thou hast put *all things in subjection under His [viz. Christ's] feet.* For in that He put *all* in subjection under Him, He left nothing that is not put under Him."

1 Pet. iii. 22, "Who is gone into heaven, and is *on the right hand of God; angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto Him.*"

Rev. iii. 21, "Even as I also overcame, and *am set down with my Father in His throne.*"

See also the passages, "*Thought it not robbery to be equal with God;*"—"*Being in the form of God;*"—and the passage where the Almighty is represented as addressing Him, "*Thy throne, O God.*"*

* "God," in Scripture, denotes a mighty being, not necessarily Jehovah.

Then, as to our second point,—if the *New Testament* does require us to pray to Christ, it is a denial of Christ's dignity to neglect it; and if the *New Testament* does not give its sacred sanction to the practice, prayer to Christ is idolatry.

The subject may at one time or other assume, to every one of us, a serious form. It is not an isolated point of faith, it affects *all our devotions*. It is not for the diversion of the hour that we should so settle our faith, in either speculation by ourselves alone, or in controversy with others, but to smooth the way for our thoughts and meditations in the hour of sorrow, sickness or depression, when the mind and body may not be able to bear the weight of reasoning, but when it may be an indescribable consolation to have a settled faith as to *whom* we should offer up our—short they may be and feeble—prayers.

By *prayer* to Christ, we mean *all communion*—all that is directed *to* Christ in *action, thought or sentiment*—all communion that makes Christ the *object*—all that *terminates* in Him;—not *mediatorial* prayer, in which Christ is regarded as the *Medium* through which our *higher* prayers are presented to the *Most High God*. We speak now only of that prayer which when offered up will make Christ the *distinct* and *ultimate* object.

Brevity is a remarkable peculiarity of all New Testament prayers. "*Long prayers*" and "*much speaking*" (as asserted in the number on "Social Prayer") have no countenance from Jesus Christ and his Apostles, whose grandest prayers are short, earnest and expressive ejaculations.

It must not be said that prayer to Christ, the Son of God, carries with it a sanction of prayers to Saints, Angels and to Mary, the Mother of Christ. As to prayers to Saints, when Paul and Barnabas were at Lystra, they forbade the people to worship them. Again, as to Angels, when the revelator John would have worshipped the Angel "*who showed him these things*," the Angel rebuked him, saying, "*See thou do it not.*" So again, as to

the Mother of Christ ;—Did ever any of the Apostles worship her? Did ever Christ? Did He regard her with any reverence beyond that dictated by true filial affection? His salutation was, "*Woman, behold thy Son;*" that of the Roman Prayer-book is, "*O holy Mother of God.*"

To dignify, in our proper religious worship, other mediators, *though only for intercession*, invades the authority of the "*one Mediator between God and man.*" Apart from religious worship, prayer, not expressly forbidden, *to any beings*, limited to objects within their province to bestow, cannot be condemned. We petition the king, parliament and private individuals. The practice in our ordinary affairs is no contravention of any law of God; but the only beings allowed by the New Testament to be worshipped in our *devotions*, properly so called, are the *one God Almighty* and His Son Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom "*every knee shall bow.*"

It may—it will—be said, that this exaltation of Christ as an ultimate object of worship, detracts from the glory and supremacy of Jehovah. We answer, the glory of God is not magnified by the degradation or disparagement of Jesus Christ, but the very contrary. Jesus Christ says "*My Father is greater than I;*"* and he says also, "*All things are delivered unto Me of my Father.*"† When we glorify Him who *derives* majesty, we proportionately glorify Him who *confers* that majesty. However, lest there should be any doubt or confusion, let us turn from conjecturing, and revert to the *plain word of God* in the New Testament :—

Matt. xviii. 20, "For where two or three are gathered together *in my Name*, there am I in the midst of them."

See this and two preceding verses. What can this mean, besides close, direct spiritual communion with Christ,—i. e. "*Asking,*"—"Meeting in His name"—"*He in the midst?*"

Matt. xxviii. 16, 17, "The eleven . . . they worshipped Him."

Luke xxiv. 51, 52, "He was carried up into heaven. And they worshipped Him."

* John xiv. 28.

† Matt. xi. 27.

1 Cor. i. 2, "Called to be saints with all that in every place call upon the Name of Jesus Christ our Lord."

And in many passages, "*The Name*" is the same as the *Person* or *Being*; thus, calling on the "*Name of the Lord*" is calling on "*The Lord*."

Acts iii. 6, "*In the Name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth rise up and walk.*"

Acts viii. 59, "*Lord Jesus, receive my spirit.*"

Acts ix. 5, 6, "And he said, *Who art thou, Lord?* And the Lord said, *I am Jesus* And he [Paul] said, *Lord what wilt thou have me to do?* And the Lord said unto him, *Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do.*"

Acts ix. 14, "*To bind all that call on thy Name.*"

Rom. i. 7, "*Grace to you, and peace from . . . the Lord Jesus Christ.*"

1 Cor. i. 3, "*Grace be unto you, and peace, from . . . the Lord Jesus Christ.*"

1 Cor. x. 9, "*Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted.*"

Phil. ii. 10, "*That at the Name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth.*"

Phil. ii. 19, "*I trust in the Lord Jesus to send Timotheus.*"

Namely, reposing on Christ to be thus enabled.

1 Thes. iii. 11, "*Our Lord Jesus Christ direct our way unto you.*"

Leading, and being led, in which we cannot exclude the idea of *communion*.

2 Thes. ii. 16, 17, "*Our Lord Jesus Christ Himself . . . comfort your hearts, and stablish you in every good word and work.*"

1 Tim. i. 2, "*Grace, mercy, and peace from . . . Jesus Christ our Lord.*"

The same 2 Tim. i. 2; also Tit. i. 4.

The Apostle, in his blessing, not referring beyond Christ, teaches us a like limitation in the worship and praise which we return. This honour to the Begotten, magnifies the honour of Him who begot.

1 Tim. i. 12, "*And I thank Christ Jesus our Lord, who hath enabled me,*" &c.

2 Tim. iv. 22, "*The Lord Jesus Christ be with thy spirit.*"

Heb. i. 6, "*When he bringeth in the First Begotten into the world, he saith, 'And let all the ANGELS OF GOD worship Him.'*"

If *Angels* are, shall not men?

2 Pet. iii. 18, "*Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. To Him be glory both now and for ever. Amen.*"

Rev. i. 5, 6, "*Unto Him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in His own blood . . . to Him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.*"

Rev. xxii. 20, "*Even so, come, Lord Jesus.*"

These passages show by *command, example* or *strong inference*, that prayer should be offered up to Christ. Some passages show that He does *now* exercise an interference in the affairs of men. If He did "*send the Spirit of Truth*"—if He has "*dominion*"—is with His followers "*always to the end of the world*"—is in our "*midst*"—sends "*peace*"—if on our asking He "*will do it*"—is to be "*trusted in*"—"directs and comforts our hearts"—manifests Himself to us—"will come to us"—"will make His abode" with us—"directs our way"—"receives our spirit." If thus He communes, shall we not pray to Him?

Our object is to set forth the dignity of Christ, by showing that, as "*Lord over all*," we should address Him terminatively in prayer. This is compatible with a devout jealousy for the glory of God, who will not "*give His glory to another*." Were prayer to the ALMIGHTY GOD now our subject, we would say, with Dr. Watts, "*Prayer to God the Father is, by His pre-eminence, of PRIMARY importance*." Moreover, there should be no confusion. Distinct times are best for each kind of prayer: the same as to hymns. An appropriate prelude would be, in the case of audible prayer to Christ, "*Let us pray to Jesus Christ alone*."

To conclude. "*See if these things are so*"—"search the Scriptures"—hear Jesus Christ—hear the Apostles—what do they say? Read again—write down every *plain* passage—not the *obscure, disputed, controverted* or *doubtful*;—take the whole of those that are *clear* and *distinct*—use reason and Scripture conjointly;—let us pray for Divine assistance;—and then, if we should fail, fallibility is not guilt, and reward will be for sincerity, not for success.

S. H.

NATIONAL RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

THOUGHTS

ON THE

PRACTICABILITY

OF A

COMPREHENSIVE SYSTEM

OF

NATIONAL

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

By S. H.

LONDON:

PUBLISHED BY J. H. WOODLEY,

30, FORE STREET, CITY.

1852.

Price Sixpence.

THESE "*Thoughts*" are given only as awakening suggestions: that is the extent of their pretension.

An omission, obvious at first sight, is the "*Roman Catholic element*." A name to represent that body must and ought to be included, though it is certain, from existing evidences, in Ireland, America, Sardinia, &c., that the *unbound* minds of the Roman laity would accept of a liberal system, though not emanating from themselves.

Still, the true policy of wise legislation ever must involve a neglect of *some interests*. Even *numerical* claims must often yield to wise adjustment. Counsel is not taken of Arabs at Algeria, Caffres at the Cape, nor of convicts at Van Diemen's Land.

Beguiled into the pale of the Romish communion are some of the most religiously susceptible—the loveliest spirits of our race. Most of all, these require legal protection from the by-laws of their own community. The commercial "power over power" oligarchy of priests called the Papacy claim to hold an exclusive vested interest against the education of every class;—the Catholic *people* should be consulted, and the *priests* forgotten.

S. H.

September, 1852.

LONDON:

C. HIGLY, PRINTER, PIERREFONT ROW, ISLINGTON.

TO THE
RIGHT HON. THE EARL OF CARLISLE,
DR. CUMMING,
DR. JOSEPH HUTTON,
THE REV. SAMUEL MARTIN,
DR. BEAUMONT,
AND
S. M. PETO, ESQ., M.P.,
The following Thoughts
ON THE SUBJECT OF
NATIONAL RELIGIOUS EDUCATION
ARE RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED BY
THE AUTHOR.

NATIONAL RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

THERE can be but little doubt that it is the duty of a State to provide an education of some kind, and as little doubt that it ought to be, besides being secular, both moral and religious—not sectarian, but comprehensive. With judicious arrangements, such a system might be carried out. Voluntary support is good, as far as it reaches, but it must be insufficient to support a general system.

In viewing a national question, we ought to keep to the national question. If we had only to deal with private education, our plans would be different; there is, however, between the two but little analogy.

Neither must we be charmed and diverted by ideal schemes; we must be practical; and dreamy theories, though beautiful, must give place to plainer and more practical theories. Each sectarian may naturally, and properly, *wish* for the embodiment of all his views, but when he designs for himself, conjoined with the various great sects around him, he must abate a little, and more than a little.

In a national arrangement for religious education the bases must be views upon which there is common assent; and of these there are abundance, besides the universal recognition amongst Christians of the Holy Scriptures.

The assumption, in any sect, to monopolize, as “natural instructors of youth,” the whole education of the nation, must be considered as a crotchet.

The fears of State interference with private religious liberty brought to bear on this subject only show that men of one idea jaundice every subject; and the arguments advanced, if they are worth anything, show that we ought to have no law, nor government, nor courts of judicature.

To simplify the subject, there appear five views under the heads of which the main question may be considered:—

1. The Sectarian System.
2. The Contributive System.
3. The purely Secular System.
4. The Abandonment System.
5. The Comprehensive System.

With all, except the fourth, we may take into view the voluntary element.

1. The Sectarian System. Fondness for our own views is not unreasonable. What we think right, it is right, in the abstract, to promote; but the immoderate tenacity of fallible man to his own professions and convictions often mars our best social arrangements. The object with the best of us is, we fear, on the question of national education, more to uplift our own sect, or to demolish others, than to calmly benefit the youth of our nation, or earnestly ground them in the solid fundamentals of the religion of Christ.

That we are a sectarian people it were useless to deny; and that to each, separately, for children under our own control, *sectarian education is the best*; be we of what sect we may, this may be positively affirmed; but this is not the question, although it is, by the short-sighted, made to be the question. It were better in an army, for individuals if each soldier could march “at ease” as his own comfort might suggest, but, for the general discipline, all must keep in order, and march in “time” and “step.” No attempt at domination by any sect can succeed in Great Britain. The failure to possess a limited ascendancy by Sir James

Graham's defeated bill, evidences that sectarian State power in general education is an impossibility; the attempt of any sect at such ascendancy could at most only succeed in obstruction.

It must never for one moment be lost sight of, that large social arrangements must involve, on all hands, restraint upon individual and small social rights. National rights yield to international demands—the *peculiar* interests of colonies and mother countries reciprocally give way to common interests; all restraints, taxes, and laws, are personal restraints for general benefit. Descending lower—when, by choice and circumstances, a man raises around him a domestic circle, we need not say what *individual* sacrifices he must, does, and is willing to make in almost every arrangement, of every day, to keep up a sound, healthy organization in the home community.

The foregoing reflections, as bearing on the question of national education, are submitted to all who on that subject stickle tenaciously for connexional or personal points, when the question is national, not personal, not sectional.

2. By the Contributive System, we mean that schools of a certain standing shall receive aid from the State.

This system presupposes an established school to constitute a title to aid, whereas one of the first considerations in a national system of education should be to provide schools where none now exist.

3. We have called this the Secular System, which comprehends all education which is not properly religious; in other words, secular education relates to this life and the world only; religious comprehends our relations to this life, to futurity, and to God.

We are disposed to reject a purely secular system of State education; not that we would reject it, if we could not secure something better. To teach, nationally, reading, writing, arithmetic, grammar, and some of the sciences, even without religion, would doubtless be better than no national

education at all; but we are by no means driven to such an extremity; for certainly, difficult as it may seem, we may establish schools for a secular system combined with a real religious education. *Something* would be gained by purely secular teaching; *something*, but very little, we confess; for so cheaply do we estimate all learning without an infusion of religion, that if you will not concede to us religion, we can have but weak arguments against the enemies of all forms of national education.

We are compelled to look at the practical effects of *mere* education as exhibited in the real lives of our modern public characters, both male and female. We speak of *mere* education in the different branches of learning, where it has not the sanctifying energy of religious influence.

The hackneyed axiom of "Knowledge is power" never can be truly denied; but until morality and religion can be shown to be integral parts of mental "power," the axiom will tell as much *against* as *for* the imparting of knowledge: with a perverted application, great "knowledge" is only an engine of war in the hands of an enemy.

After we have reviewed the histories of the accomplished and enlightened vile, we can have but one impression, and that is, a wish that the expense of their education had been withheld—that then the poison might have exhausted itself on its own putridity, and not have been carried, on the wings of Education, to scatter moral contamination around it.

Our statistics of uneducated crime argue as much that the cunning of educated crime can elude justice, as they show that the want of education conduces to crime; and if we put against the returns of our poor, tempted, petty-larceny thieves, at our houses of correction, the great amounts and small temptations of our great and educated swindlers, who elude all law with impunity, we shall, we regret to say, find a large balance debited to the accomplished, the refined, and the educated.

If a loose, educated gentleman should, by dropping a thread, become a transport, the fashionable cant for the "gen-

tleman and the scholar" helps the secularly-educated rogue to return from the penal settlement, leaving the uneducated convict a prey to the want of cunning, and thus confounding all the statistics of social philosophy as to the exclusive power of ignorance in generating crime.

4. The fourth is the Abandonment System, which denies altogether the right of the State to provide any education for the people.

This view we totally reject; for such a view can be only maintained when it can be shown that the State ought to be divested of all its functions: it must be shown that it has no right to make laws; that it has no right to make municipal, police, fiscal, sanitary, and social regulations; and it must be shown that each of these must be left to the chance efforts of individuals or small communities.

All that is said about "individual and parental rights," "infringement of liberty," "danger of the domination of an oligarchy," applies equally to all State interference, and would, if carried out, abolish all government and all courts of justice and equity.

On the point of parental right and authority—in Prussia parents are compelled by law to let their children be educated. They *may* do it themselves, but, if they neglect it, the State enforces the education of the children. Who would cavil against State interference in London, where parents abandon their children to crime, and in many cases, as attested by Mr. Sergeant Adams, evidence against their own children in our courts, to imprison them, that they may be rid of the cost of their maintenance?

It will be said, a religious national education involves State support of religion; in *a degree* it does; and we should regret if the Christian religion should ever *entirely* lose the countenance of the State; though we do regret that in England the State should be leagued, as it is, with a sect of such narrow creeds and articles, that those who adhere to

them are sad bigots or liars ; and the best men are driven to prevaricate in subscription, and are tempted by temporalities to belie their consciences, while they fly to the awful subterfuge, that what is professed is "*not in deed and in truth*," but "*only in form and in name*."*

We are not to embarrass a mighty national question, involving the interests of time and eternity to this and future generations, by favourite, inflexible abstractions.

If every opponent of State education could establish *all his own* views, we believe another doctrine would be preached. This may be denied ; but wherever the State has offered aid, there are not many cases of aid being refused.

5. *The Comprehensive System.* We believe that a comprehensive system of national religious education is practicable. It ought not, and would not, supersede sectarian education. This, when obtainable, *is the very best*. For a Roman Catholic, an Episcopalian, an Unitarian, a Methodist, or a Baptist, a school teaching *all* the doctrines of each respectively is better than a national school teaching only, it may be, an abstract of the faith of all.

Take this as an hypothesis :—If we had to send our children to a school, and our faith consisted of just *twelve* distinct articles, we should prefer a school where the whole *twelve* articles were taught, to another school where only *three* of these articles were taught ; but in the absence of the better school, we would send them to the next best, rather than deprive the children of all religious school instruction ; and to this straight on the question of national education, if there is to be religion in it, are we sectarians certainly driven.

Whatever State education might be, it would not supersede individual, sectarian, or parental efforts ; but, as was lately said at the Leeds Meeting, it would be only "*supplemental*,"

* See the recent Letter of the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Bishop of Exeter.

taking up where the other would cease to operate. "We are not against the sun, because we avail ourselves of gaslight in the night." A rushlight is a good light, if we cannot get another.

Were we a nation of Pagans, Jews, and Mahomedans, comprehension in religion would not bear a thought; but, in spite of exceptions, deficiencies, and contentions, this is a CHRISTIAN COUNTRY, and there is a broad basis in the recognition of the Bible—God—Christ—Christian morality—future rewards and punishments, and future responsibility, founded on the life that now is.

"Ah!" it may be said, "but look at the war of sects, the bigots, the scrambling for sectarian supremacy; you will have no coherency—nothing but repulsion." If this means that there are difficulties, we admit them; but we deny *in toto* that they are insuperable. People are dismayed by mad controversialists; they forget what an immense amount of unseen, unobtrusive, quiet piety there is in the country, ready to support a scheme of peace, principle, and comprehension.

A fear has been entertained, that in such a plan the authorities and teachers appointed would insidiously attempt to promote their own private views. Of this there is no danger. Professional bias tends so much to commercialize business men, that, even in private schools, creeds, readings, collects, prayers, and particular studies, are adopted or omitted at the suggestion of parents to a surprising extent. It was stated, in the Common Council of London, a short time since, that in the City of London School there were educated Jews, Episcopalians, Unitarians, and Wesleyans.

We would not have the name of "*Charity*" connected with national schools. The name, as a school distinction, is withering. Every child ought to feel it to be a *right*, and as such it should be enjoyed with as much independence as is compatible with reverence for all good national institutions.

We believe six men might be selected from six of the principal sects, who would submit such a scheme to the

country as would be all but universally acceptable ; and to please every one no man in his senses would expect.

If the attempt were made with such representatives as Dr. Philpotts on the one hand, and Dr. Campbell on the other, who might not despair ? But unless better names can be suggested, we will give—to represent the Episcopalians (Dr. Stanley being dead), the Earl of Carlisle ; for the Presbyterians, Dr. John Cumming ; for the Wesleyans, Dr. Beaumont ; for the Unitarians, Dr. Joseph Hutton ; for the Congregationalists, the Rev. Samuel Martin ; and for the Baptists, Mr. S. M. Peto. With such a commission, aided by the *prestige* of royal appointment, we believe we should have such a scheme reported, as would, when embodied in a law, be acceptable, and such an one as would work well for *religious* education, which is the *only education* that will effectually conduce to the solid happiness of individuals and communities.

The introduction of such a plan by Lord John Russell would not tarnish his present fame in connexion with education and religious liberty.

We submit these thoughts to abler minds than our own. To those minds they may be a starting point. For ourselves, we may call these desultory thoughts ; we have not the mind to conceive, nor the industry to detail, the minutiae of any great plan ; yet we have a clear perception of the importance of the object ; and—we say it without cant—it is a consolation to us to *endeavour* to promote that object, although it should result in our failing to aid it by even only a suggestion or a hint.

S. H.



